ORIGINA



1 2

FENNEMORE CRAIG A Professional Corporation

Jay L. Shapiro (No. 014650)

3003 North Central Avenue. Suite 2600

Phoenix, Arizona 85012

Telephone (602) 916-5000

ENAMED

7811 JAN -2 A 11: 37

HOISSIMM BAST CONTROL

4 5

3

Attorneys for Valley Utilities Water Company, Inc.

6

7

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

8 9

10

11

12

OF VALLEY UTILITIES WATER COMPANY, INC., AN ARIZONA CORPORATION, FOR A DETERMINATION

OF THE FAIR VALUE OF ITS UTILITY PLANT AND PROPERTY AND FOR AN **INCREASE IN ITS RATES AND CHARGES**

FOR UTILITY SERVICE BASED THEREON.

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION

RESPONSE TO STAFF'S MOTION TO EXTEND FILING DUE DATE

DOCKET NO. W-01412A-12-0195

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

Valley Utilities Water Company ("VUWCO" or the "Company") hereby submits its Response to Staff's Motion to Extend Filing Due Date. In its motion, Staff requests that the deadline for filing direct testimony be extended by one week, from Monday, December 31, 2012 to Monday, January 7, 2013, citing "resource constraints" as the reason for the request. Staff suggests consequently shortening the periods for both rebuttal and surrebuttal by two days each to make up the time and to "accommodat[e] the existing hearing date."

Staff's motion is not well-received. In July 2012, Staff agreed to the procedural schedule currently in place. Staff has been aware of the December 31 deadline for more than five months. Staff also has known the importance of retaining the February 27, 2013 VUWCO is requesting to make permanent the Arsenic Remediation hearing date. Surcharge Mechanism approved in Decision No. 71287 (October 7, 2009), which surcharge is set to expire on August 31, 2013. The Company and Staff together

1

2

developed a schedule that would ensure the issuance of a final order and authorization of new rates prior to August 31. If the surcharge expires before the new rates go into effect, the Company will be severely prejudiced.

Staff did not advise VUWCO of this needed extension until the morning of December 31, 2012. VUWCO objects to Staff's suggestion that its failure to adhere to the procedural schedule be remedied by shortening the time the Company has to prepare rebuttal. The rebuttal period is already shortened. Furthermore, the Company should not be penalized because Staff could not complete its filing in the six months it was allotted. In sum, if Staff needs more time, the Company should not be prejudiced in any way, including not having its limited rebuttal-window made tighter or losing its long-scheduled hearing date.

Accordingly, VUWCO respectfully requests that if Staff is afforded the extra time it requests, the Administrative Law Judge issue a Procedural Order that affords the Company its time to prepare rebuttal and preserves the existing hearing dates.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 2nd day of January, 2013.

FENNEMORE CRAIG, P.C.

By:

Shapiro

Attorneys for Valley Utilities Water Company, Inc.

21

22

ORIGINAL and 13 copies filed this 2nd day of January, 2013 with:

Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 West Washington Street

Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Docket Control

23

24

25

26

	J
1	COPY of the foregoing
2	was hand-delivered this 2nd day of January 2013 to:
3	Sarah Harpring, ALJ
4	Hearing Division Arizona Corporation Commission
5	1200 West Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007
6	Wes Van Cleve
7	Bridget Humphrey Legal Division
8	Arizona Corporation Commission
9	1200 West Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007
10	By: Main san Jol 7823691.2/024964.0005
11	7823691.2/024964.0005
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	